THOMAS HAUSCHILD / UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN

Christians, Jews, and the Other in German Anthropology

Although German-born and deeply rooted in the intellectual tradition of his homeland, Franz Boas, more than any other man, defined the "national character" of anthropology in the United States. [Stocking 1974:1]

In this passage, George Stocking leaves one of his own insights unexplored. National anthropologies, he says, can be seen as little "nations" that develop their own foreign policy and, through that policy's set of classifications, influence the official foreign policy of their host nations. In particular, they formulate ideas of origins, laying down the distinction between "us" and "them." According to John Borneman (1995) and others, American cultural anthropology created an ambivalent other, the Indian, who was both the romanticized precursor to American civilization and a potentially dangerous enemy living within that civilization. German anthropology, working with similar practices of othering, took a quite different course of theoretical development, one that resonated in a unique way with German culture and its politics. Stocking's observation reminds us that anthropological theory does not develop in isolation but in a cultural and historical matrix that shapes it. This can be seen in the forms American and German anthropology took early in this century, forms that are quite different despite having common roots.

This divergence is documented in a 1933 essay by the Jewish American anthropologist Paul Radin (see Radin 1966). In it he characterized German anthropology as obsessed with the simple dichotomy of psychic unity and diffusion, the uniqueness of particular cultures, and the quest for origins, and thus with nationalism (Kramer 1985). In Radin's view, these rather odd concepts, derived from German Romanticism, centered on a speculative way of comprehending the other through the exercise of "empathy," which he considered a misunderstanding of the data through projection. Radin then traced the cause of this problem to one "vastly overrated and muddleheaded thinker" (1966:72) among the founding fathers of German anthropology. In contrast, these same foundational ideas, when transplanted to America, developed into the core of a new and successful school of social theory, Boas's cultural anthropology.

How could the ideas of this muddleheaded thinker, in a slightly varied form and in another cultural context, become fundamental to today's largest anthropological "nation," American cultural anthropology? Why is it that German anthropology, rooted in one of the world's most influential philosophical traditions, wasted its reputation in developing a racist anthropological pseudoscience and today remains outside the power play of anthropological nations (Borneman 1995)? What, we may ask, is the relationship between ideas and practice, and how can we defend ourselves today against those ideas and practices that led German anthropologists into the disastrous universe of national socialist discourse?

Origins, Version 1

In its nascency, German anthropology exhibited a mixture of perspectives and ideas drawn from the complex German cultural heritage of romanticism and rationalism (Kramer 1977, 1985, 1989). It was under the rubric of the disciplined development of the mind *(Bildung)*, as developed by the German philosopher-voyagers Alexander and Wilhelm von Humboldt in the early 19th century, that romanticism and rationalism were united in Friedrich Ratzel's historical geography and in the *Ethnologie* founded by Adolf Bastian (1826–1905). Bastian, who was Radin's muddleheaded thinker, was also the first, and for a long time the only, holder of a chair of ethnology in Germany.

THOMAS HAUSCHILD is a professor of ethnology and director of the Institute of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Tübingen, Schloss, 72070 Tübingen, Germany.

American Anthropologist 99(4):746–753. Copyright © 1997, American Anthropological Association.

Bastian theorized that human beings everywhere shared basic forms of thought *(Elementargedanken)*, which they rearranged into the renewable bricolage of national folk ideas *(Völkergedanken)*. These premises, based on older theological concepts, are echoed in the works of scholars such as Edward Tylor, James Frazer, Claude Lévi-Strauss, and Gregory Bateson (Koepping 1983). German anthropology, then, had an important place in the concert of little anthropological nations that developed during the prolonged process of separation from theology, history, psychology, and sociology. Bastian's classificatory sons, including Richard Thurnwald (1869–1954), Leo Frobenius (1873–1938), and Father Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1954), made anthropology a true academic discipline and established themselves internationally in the process. There were other important personalities in that generation of anthropologists, such as Diedrich Westermann or Karl von den Steinen (Kramer 1985; Radin 1966:76), but only Thurnwald, Schmidt, and Frobenius succeeded in building fully developed schools of anthropological discourse and sites of anthropological power.

Thurnwald founded a German structuralist and functionalist school that persists today (see Thurnwald 1929, 1933, 1934). It parallels and integrates British, French, and American anthropological thought while giving functionalist interpretation a historicist accent. Frobenius and Schmidt, unlike Thurnwald, are less well known among today's younger German anthropologists. Frobenius construed *Völkerkunde* as "culture history" and thus introduced hermeneutical and historical reasoning into German anthropology as "ethnohistory" (Jensen 1963). Schmidt (1939), in turn, introduced a theory of primary monotheism, which today is perceived as extremely odd. But his status as a contributor to contemporary anthropology in Germany may be explained by the fact that he survived World War II despite having been victimized by the Nazis. In the years immediately after the war, he brought integrity to that little academic nation so deeply involved in the construction of the Third Reich (Schmidt 1950). Schmidt's role in this endeavor is evident in the fact that *Anthropos*, a journal founded to serve Schmidt's Catholic anthropology, has become the forum of our anthropological nation, more so than *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, the official journal of the German Association of Anthropologists and the Berlin Society for Anthropology and Prehistory.

It is no accident that in the 1930s Thurnwald found more academic followers in the United States than in Germany (Melk-Koch 1989:286 ff.), that Frobenius is honored in Africa for inspiring one of the first movements of black self-consciousness (Senghor 1977), and that Schmidt was for half a century the central figure mediating between anthropological reasoning and the Catholic Church (Brandewie 1990). Although they differed greatly, these anthropologists were united in their efforts to define cultures, or ethnic units, as material and ideal enterprises characterized by the historical process. Schmidt, Frobenius, and Thurnwald adhered to a historical paradigm that emphasized diffusionism against evolutionism and, later, functionalism. They visualized societies as achieving organization, in harmony or conflict, in coexistence or domination, through the processes of imitation *(Kulturkreise)* inherent in diffusion and function. These activities and ideas helped them achieve a certain international reputation, until, having ignored the advent of cultural relativism around 1938, they let their names be drawn into the racist speculations of the 1930s. When confronted with the anthropological standards established by the winners of World War II, the disciples of Thurnwald, Schmidt, and Frobenius fell into complete oblivion, a state from which German anthropology does not yet seem to have recovered.

Origins, Version 2

There is no comprehensive historical account of German völkerkunde as an academic endeavor (Kramer 1985; Radin 1966). This permitted the creation of the "official" genealogy of the discipline, recounted above, following the oral tradition presented to my generation of students by most of our teachers (born between 1920 and 1940). Certainly my version of the official genealogy omits names considered important by some of my colleagues. Also, some will certainly deny that their forefathers were as heavily involved with racism as I claim. But the more obvious fact of this official but informal genealogy as a whole is the gaps, most notably the missing generation that would be Bastian's classificatory eldest sons, as well as some important contemporary cofounders of organized anthropological reasoning in Germany. This habit of exclusion tells us more about German anthropology than any denunciation of our predecessors' concrete political sins.

Moritz Lazarus (1824–1903) and Heymann Steinthal (1823–99) are much less known among German anthropologists today than Adolf Bastian (Belke 1971; Whitman 1984). Working in the same Humboldtian atmosphere in Berlin as Bastian, the "ethnopsychology" that they fashioned stressed not the organization of elementargedanken into folk ideas but rather the universal character of those traits. In 1861 they cofounded the interdisciplinary journal *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* (Journal of ethnopsychology and linguistics). In 1869 Bastian successfully founded the more narrowly focused *Zeitschrift für Völkerkunde* (Journal of ethnology). When Lazarus and Steinthal retired from anthropological discussion in 1891, their

interdisciplinary journal was transformed into a vehicle for a very narrow approach to the study of national folklore and rechristened *Zeitschrift des Ver-eins für Volkskunde* (Journal of the association of folklorists), which remains a leading German journal under the name *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde.*

The integrated approach to ethnopsychology survived only in the work of Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920), professor of psychology at Leipzig, under whom the young Bronisław Malinowski, in 1908, would start his career as an anthropologist (Kuper 1978:24–25). Wundt maintained the liberal position: that the interplay between mentality, language, and social organization does not necessarily lead to the development of fixed national character but is to be understood as a "heterogeneity of ends" (Wundt 1903:274), a rather casual and self-organizing relation to be analyzed on the basis of cross-cultural research.

It was also in the 1890s, a period strongly marked by growing anti-Semitism, snowballing nationalism, and an ever-increasing repression of "cosmopolitan" socialism, that the most important and creative disciples of Bastian, Steinthal, and Lazarus, namely Franz Boas (1858–1942) and Georg Simmel (1858–1918), realized that they did not have a future in the German anthropological nation. Simmel converted to German sociology, which he enriched with his influential concept of the marginal individual as a paradigmatic phenomenon of modern mass culture and with his idea of an ethnography of the modern world that rejects primitivist and naturalistic allegories for social life (see Simmel 1950). Sociology, for its part, was not very grateful, as Simmel remained an assistant professor for most of his life. He died in 1918 as a professor of sociology in Strassburg, far away from Berlin, the center of German anthropological thought. His last letters give a rather bitter account of his career (Loyke 1992:116; Rammstedt 1992: 877 ff.). Boas chose to emigrate to the United States, where he created a cultural anthropology based on a relativistic concept of human culture as an ensemble of historically "particular" organizations. His cultural relativism echoed the particularistic political organizations of the old German reich, overcome by the Prussians in 1871. Even in his old age, he continued to travel Germany giving lectures on his liberal and relativistic concept of culture (Boas 1929).

The new centralized reich adopted local habits of marginalizing Jews and turned anti-Semitic rhetoric into an asset for the national campaigns. The victims of these campaigns were the same Jewish intellectuals who, in the first half of the 19th century, had been instrumental in giving provincial Berlin a more cosmopolitan appearance. In Germany there is a long line of descent of anthropologists identified as Jews who were excluded from universities and from intellectual life. This is an observable historical fact. Less well understood is the fact that with this exclusion of persons came the exclusion of ideas (Hauschild 1995). Relativism, recognition of the stranger in society, and culturalism (as opposed to nationalism and biologism) found little audience among the second and third generations of the German anthropological nation (Conte and Essner 1994). At the same time, the promising vision of a multidisciplinary anthropological approach that could draw together the views of folklore, non-European ethnology, linguistics, archaeology, psychology, and sociology fell prey to the exclusionary mode. The pseudointegrative Nazi science of the 1930s and 1940s restored the multidisciplinary program, but only in the distorted form of an eclectic and speculative quest for a race of superhumans.

The construction of German anthropology as two separate disciplines that lacked any interdisciplinary link reached its apex with the foundation of a society for "Jüdische Volkskunde" in Hamburg in 1898 (Daxelmüller 1987a, 1987b). As an object of anthropological study, the German Jewish tradition was neither German volkskunde, understood as the study of the Christian German self, nor völkerkunde, understood as the study of the exotic other; it was thus relegated to a little academic "ghetto of the spirits," as the great Austrian Jewish anthropologist Friedrich Salomon Krauss put it (Daxelmüller 1987a:9). The same was true for the anthropology of other European and Mediterranean societies. Not being outside Europe, they could not be encompassed by völkerkunde, and not being German, they were not included in volkskunde. In Germany today the study of contemporary Jewish culture, as well as the ethnological and folkloric study of Spain, Poland, or Tunisia, is still practiced in a no-man's-land between the two anthropological disciplines.

Racial Pride and Self-Hatred in the 1930s

Having lost World War I and been cast in the role of a pariah among European nations, many Germans, through rituals of physical self-evaluation for racial classification, tried to affiliate with the superhuman race that, according to racist prophecies, would replace the existing German and European popoulations. Physical criteria were based on the model of the *Nordischer Typus*, a standard few Germans were able to meet (Schultz 1937). Most Germans, as was pointed out by biological anthropologist Hans Günther (1939[1930]:9 ff.), had to define themselves as being of mixed race, as misfits in the true sense of the term. Exploiting the misfits' feelings of insufficiency and self-hatred, Nazis encouraged them to choose the right partner for reproduction in order to make their children and

grandchildren conform more closely to the Nordischer typus.

Strangely enough, *self-hatred* was also a central term in the German and Austrian Jewish debate of that period (Gilman 1986). It was coined in 1930 by the German Jewish author and philosophical anthropologist Theodor Lessing (1930a) and encapsulated a longer debate on the problem of Jews' view of themselves as misfits in the face of German cultural and linguistic hegemony. Today we might find even stranger the fact that quotations from German Jewish philosopher Martin Buber's (1916) writings are peppered throughout the texts of this same Hans Günther (1939[1930]:3, 449). Buber, writing at this time as a Zionist, praised the racial pride of the Jewish nation as an answer to a smoldering anti-Semitism. Examining this coincidence might provide us with a key to understanding German culture in the 1920s and 1930s, one that would transcend characterizations that tend to attack "wrong" intellectual concepts rather than investigate the spirit of the time. In that period all Germans, whether Christians, Jews, or self-determined pagans, gave racial evaluation and adjustment the same importance that is now given to the issue of health in Western societies (Gilman 1986:42, 244).

It is precisely in that atmosphere of trauma and self-hatred, of racism and expressionism, of body consciousness and the politics of the body, that German anthropology became a fully developed academic discipline (Streck 1989). In the 1920s and 1930s several new chairs were created, and in 1929 the Association of Ethnologists was founded (Krause 1930). Shortly afterward it took the name that it bears today: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde (German Association of Ethnologists). As far as we know, none of the numerous German anthropologists of Jewish ancestry were appointed to these new chairs (Riese 1995). This was paralleled by the exclusion of women, who were accepted only in rare cases as "auxiliary academic workers" (Hauser-Schäublin 1991), as well as foreigners and colonial subjects and their descendants. These exclusionary movements had a markedly negative impact on German anthropological thought, depriving the discipline of ideas and methods relating to a relativistic and universalistic interpretation of human behavior. Moreover, they isolated German anthropology from international currents that might have stimulated alternative developments. In the end, the discriminatory logic implicit in these exclusionary practices may well have been one of the reasons why the discipline remained infertile in the years following the war.

An obvious example is the case of Father Wilhelm Schmidt, the personal confessor of the last Austrian kaiser and an advisor to Pope Pius XII. Schmidt was a radical anti-Semite in theory and practice. Drawing on 19th-century theories of a non-Semite primary monotheism, his work aimed at dethroning the Hebrews as the direct predecessors of the Christians. Throughout his life, he claimed that remote, dwarflike, and dark-skinned peoples directly received God's revelation long before Moses. For Schmidt, barbarians such as the Yanomamo or Pygmies were far preferable to the Jews because these primitive peoples still carried the primary revelation of monotheistic thought and remained faithful to their racial origins. In his conception the Jews, being racially mixed and practicing a caricature of primary monotheism, were parasites who threatened the organic and eternal constitution of those participating in the divine revelation. They disturbed the racial and cultural unity of European peoples by severing contact with the primary revelation and turning it into an object of scrutiny. In anti-Semitic newspapers, Schmidt wrote outspokenly in favor of Italian fascism (Conte 1987). He stood in conflict with national socialism, but only because it dismissed the Catholic Church. It is for this reason that he was persecuted when the Nazis conquered Vienna in 1938 and thus afterward appeared to be a victim of the Third Reich.

Unlike Schmidt, Leo Frobenius was ambivalent about the Jews, rarely making public any decisive opinion. His only committed words appeared in a journal dedicated to fighting German anti-Semitism. Yet in this article, Frobenius (1930) agreed that Jews were misfits: not a race, not a nation, not the followers of a true religion, but a mixture on all counts. When dominating a nation, he wrote, the Jews could become very effective leaders, as Disraeli was—an argument that, I suppose, had flattered the journal's editors—but when dominated, Jews would undermine society with treacherous activities. According to Frobenius, Jews participated in both the exotic and the German, and as such had no true *paideuma*, no gestalt, and no *Zucht* (race, soul). They were the antithesis of all organic culture, artificial and overrationalizing. In his view, Jews were not part of the rainbow of cultures traceable to antediluvian Atlantis, the source of the only true civilizations according to that master of occidental supremacy, Plato. Following what Léon Poliakov (1971) has identified as the primary model of 19th- and 20th-century anti-Semitic thought, Frobenius's speculative anthropology was based upon the myth of the deluge, including the idea that Noah's rival sons (Shem, Ham, and Japheth) were the founders of the primary cultures of the world. In forwarding this myth as the basis of his theory, Frobenius succeeded in creating a positive image of some African tribes. In an era of hatred directed against all non-Nordic peoples, he depicted these primitives as more organic and authentic in their worldview than Jews.

In the writings of Richard Thurnwald's disciple Wilhelm Mühlmann (1904–88) is the clearest evidence that

the construction of the Jew was a cornerstone of German anthropology. Building on Thurnwald's structural-historicist concept that culture is maintained by racially homogeneous elites, Mühlmann depicted the Jews as a unique phenomenon: they were not a race or nation and had no true history or ethos. Racially mixed and spatially dispersed, they were more than a religious community because they practiced endogamy and presented themselves as a cultural minority. They were a *Scheinvolk*, a "pseudoethnos" (Mühlmann 1944a:99, 1944b:143; see also Michel 1992:89 ff.). As was characteristic of that gifted and venomous writer, his conception of pseudoethnos anticipated the deconstruction of ethnic categories that was so important in the anthropological discussions of the 1980s. But after that initial deconstruction, Mühlmann never moved to the conclusion that there could be nonethnic ways of feeling at home. On the contrary, he advocated the banishment of the Jews, claiming that they disturbed the process of creating a pure race within one nation. Mühlmann did not prefer the Yanomamo or Pygmies or any other group, as Schmidt and Frobenius did, but he was an admirer of Polynesian nobility, which, he believed, emerged in a merciless fight for racial purity and political hegemony (Mühlmann 1938). Rethinking and re-creating anthropology as a science not of the description of ethnos but of its creation, Mühlmann eliminated the border between volkskunde and völkerkunde so sharply drawn by his German predecessors. As the founder of a new ethnology of Europe, he was chosen to lead an interdisciplinary institute for research on eastern Europe which had been created by the Third Reich and was situated in then-occupied Prague (Michel 1992). Only the Allied victory stopped him from founding an interdisciplinary, revolutionary, and self-reflexive school of racial anthropology without parallel.

This newly established academic discipline völkerkunde was theoretically and practically construed through the invention of an other. At the time, the primitive seemed the appropriate object of study. To understand and honor the culture of the primitive was such a deeply felt desire among German anthropologists that in the 1930s, many years before their British and American colleagues, some of them declined to call their object of study *Naturvölker*, or "primitive," because they wanted to stress the coevalness of this other.[1] That special brand of romanticism can easily be traced back to the paternalistic and colonial attitudes from which it stemmed (Thurnwald 1939). But there was simultaneously a second, hidden conceptualization of the other as brutish and savage: the Jew. Since Jews participated in German civilization, especially its intellectual life, they were considered sophisticated savages and hence the most dangerous enemy.

Meanwhile, as demonstrated by Borneman (1995), American anthropology cultivated the image of an interior primitive very much detached from academic discourse: the Indian. Thus Americans located their sophisticated enemy outside their borders, in Germany, for instance. Luckily, Communists did not fall into any clear-cut ethnic category; so American anthropologists could continue to integrate groups of immigrant strangers according to the agenda of repressing and/or saving their interior other while defending against exterior others who presented themselves as alien nations. In contrast, German anthropologists needed to present themselves as a racially superior group living with and among dangerous savages (Olender 1987; von See 1970). Both anthropological nations, German and American, were built on a vast literary tradition of primitivism and exoticism. Both nourished and exalted the idea of culture, deeply rooted in the occidental tradition from Plato to Creuzer and Nietzsche (Kramer 1985, 1989), that was exemplified and yet skeptically analyzed by Franz Boas. But in the different contexts of their host nations' quests for integrity, these two anthropological nations developed very different forms of foreign policy.

Competition with monotheistic Judaism (Schmidt), ambivalence in the confrontation with Jews (Frobenius), and the scientific plan to eliminate the Jews (Mühlmann) gave German anthropology its profile. These attitudes not only reflect what has long been the German way of dealing with the presumed inner enemy but are also characteristic of a general notion of culture which could not include the stranger. In Germany this notion was a development of the 1890s and directly opposed Simmel's suggestions. The mentality expressed in these attitudes continued to dominate the German anthropological construction of the other after World War II, but one fact has been erased from memory: that German völkerkunde had materially and ideally constructed the Jews as the internal enemy and had thus contributed to the creation of the Third Reich and its program of mass murder.

The Excluded

Anthropologists Paul Leser and Leonhard Adam, as well as many younger colleagues and students, fled Germany to escape racial persecution. Adam was compelled to leave after a hysterical 1936 campaign against his editorship of the *Lehrbuch der Völkerkunde*, a campaign that expanded into a series of denunciations of German völkerkundlers' association with Jews (Hauschild 1987:251 ff.). But Adam and Leser, even before their emigration, never obtained academic chairs; they were simply well-known outsiders. In the United States

and Australia, they continued to produce the same type of anthropology they had practiced before: Leser conducted historical research on material culture (1931), and Adam worked on a structural-functionalist anthropology of law and art (Adam 1950; Schultz-Ewerth and Adam 1929–30). During and after the war, Leser and Adam tried to maintain friendly relations with their former colleagues, but they were now irretrievably excluded.

Since Jews in Germany were cut off from research grants and academic chairs, they often had to engage in fields of organized reflections that were more open, such as journalism. In the 1920s and 1930s many anthropologists earned a living by writing books and articles. Walter Benjamin, supported by a Jewish donation, not only studied German culture but also conducted a historical and materialist investigation of all cultures, as well as of the human universals of modernity (Wiggershaus 1991:71, 292). More central examples are journalists such as Michael Landmann (1961), a disciple of Simmel and one of the creators of the term *Kulturwissenschaften*, and Paul Ludwig Landsberg, creator of a poetic anthropology based on the opposition between pre-Socratic and modern culture (1934:103–109). Finally, Theodor Lessing (1930b, 1981[1921]), who, having been thrown out of the University of Hannover in 1925 by anti-Semites, criticized Western ethnocentrism and technology from the perspective of Brahmanic Indian culture.

All of these authors often worked in a speculative manner, in terms of a philosophy of culture, but constantly reflected on ideas of the self, the other, and the margins. Many of these outsiders of the academic business were linked to French surrealism, and so it was to France that Landsberg and Landmann fled. Lessing went to Czechoslovakia, where he was murdered in 1933 by assassins in the pay of the Nazis. Meanwhile, some of the would-be German surrealists indulged in a very uncritical and fanciful vision of other cultures, which they admired as an alternative to the occidental order.

While academic anthropologists in Germany often failed because of their essentialist conceptions of culture and because they lacked the courage, the intelligence, or the circumstances to develop relativistic and universalistic approaches, these alternative anthropological thinkers lacked a dialogue with the other, or, in other words, they lacked empirical data. The period was one in which an integrated German anthropology might have developed in the nonpositivist and nontotalizing framework of hermeneutic sociology, which Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer sought to develop and which today's international anthropology, deeply split into particular schools, seems to be desperately seeking.

Among the Jews, competition, ambivalence, and exclusion were answered by self-hatred and opportunism (Adam and Leser), by the development of interdisciplinary alternatives (Benjamin), and by a speculative counteranthropology (Landmann and Lessing). After the war the folkloric volkskunde, in the custody of Germanic studies, history, and sociology, found new solutions in the form of a critical self-assessment and the effective management of popular cultural heritage. In the German völkerkunde, however, deeply split and damaged as it was, only those marginal to the academic mainstream, such as Fritz Kramer (1977, 1993) and Hans-Peter Duerr (1985), anticipated the postmodern movement and, building on alternative anthropological approaches ranging from those of Simmel to those of Benjamin, won a certain international reputation. Now it is up to the newly established professors, born in the 1940s and 1950s, to free themselves from the unproductive dichotomies of exclusion versus inclusion, dull scientific seriousness versus freelance popular writing, and national versus universal positions in anthropological discourse.

Conclusions

There is no absolute defense against racism in anthropology. Paul Radin's ideas about German anthropology must be reevaluated in light of the complex relations between the German spirit of the times and general anthropological discourse. The relation between ideas and practice should not be naively understood as one of simple cause and effect. What in the German cultural milieu appeared to be ideas about psychic unity produced by a muddleheaded thinker were transformed in the American cultural context into cultural relativism, a powerful anthropological approach. Structural functionalism, in its time the most advanced anthropological theory available, mutated in Germany into an intriguing caricature of itself, bearing anti-Semitic concepts and arguments justifying racial war. The postmodern and radical relativist positions so prevalent in the American anthropology of the 1980s could have been developed ten years earlier by the intellectual descendants of Nazi anthropologists. I should not be forgotten that habits can prevail over rational thought, since there are anthropological nations now in the making or in certain processes of transformation that could exhibit the extreme features of intellectual disintegration, racism, and marginalization of thoughts and people that surfaced in Germany.

It is striking that the continuous boom of anthropological study and research in Germany has been accompanied by a new diversification of approaches and, as Heymann Steinthal (1891) prophesied a hundred years

ago, by a new discussion of those "stickers fixed to a box" that are our analytical concepts: völkerkunde, volkskunde, cultural anthropology, and cultural studies. It is time for a thorough revision of the history of intellectual reasoning and practice in this field, a process that, hopefully, not only will lead to a new anthropological policy in Germany but also will increase our general knowledge about the complex relations between anthropological nations and the domestic and foreign policies of their host countries.

Note

1. Krause 1930:44 ff.; Mühlmann 1944a:10–11; Rathjens 1947:108.

References Cited

Adam, Leonhard
1950 Criminal Law and Procedure in Nepal a Century Ago. Far Eastern Quarterly 9:146–168.

Belke, Ingrid
1971 Introduction. *In* Die Begründer der Völkerpsychologie in ihren Briefen: Moritz Lazarus und Heymann Steinthal. Ingrid Belke, ed. Pp. 1–26. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr.

Boas, Franz
1929 Rasse und seelische Veranlagung. Forschungen and Fortschritte 5:295.

Borneman, John
1995 American Anthropology as Foreign Policy. American Anthropologist 97:663–672.

Brandewie, Ernest
1990 When Giants Walked the Earth: The Life and Times of Wilhelm Schmidt. SVD, Studia Instituti Anthropos, 44. Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag.

Buber, Martin
1916 Die jüdische Bewegung. Der Jude 1:1–5.

Conte, Édouard
1987 Wilhelm Schmidt: Des letzen Kaisers Beichtvater und das "neudeutsche Heindentum." *In* Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus. Helge Gerndt, ed. Pp. 261–278. Munich, Germany: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde.

Conte, Édouard, and Cornelia Essner
1994 Völkerkunde et Nazisme ou: L'ethnologie sous l'empire des raciologues. L'Homme 34:147–173.

Daxelmüller, Christoph
1987a Die deutschsprachige Volkskunde und die Juden: Zur Geschichte und den Folgen einer kulturellen Ausklammerung. Zeitschrift für Volkskunde 83:1–20.
1987b Nationalsozialistisches Kulturverständnis und das Ende der jüdischen Volkskunde. *In* Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus. Helge Gerndt, ed. Pp. 149–168. Munich, Germany: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde.

Duerr, Hans-Peter
1985 Dreamtime: Concerning the Boundary between Wilderness and Civilization. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Frobenius, Leo
1930 Der Konflikt der Kulturstile, Abwehr-Blätter. Mitteilungen aus dem Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus 40:70–74.

Gilman, Sander
1986 Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Günther, Hans F. K.
1939[1930] Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes. Munich, Germany: Lehmanns.

Hauschild, Thomas
1987 Völkerkunde im "Dritten Reich." *In* Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus. Helge Gerndt, ed. Pp. 245–260. Munich, Germany: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde.
1995 "Dem lebendigen Geist": Warum die Geschichte der Völkerkunde im "Dritten Reich" auch für Nichtethnologen von Interesse sein kann. *In* Lebenslust und Fremdenfurcht: Ethnologie im Dritten Reich. Thomas Hauschild, ed. Pp. 13–61. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.

Hauser-Schäublin, Brigitta, ed.
1991 Ethnologische Frauenforschung: Ansätze, Methoden, Resultate. Berlin: Reimer.

Jensen, Adolf E.
1963 Myth and Cult among Primitive Peoples. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Koepping, Klaus-Peter
1983 Adolf Bastian and the Psychic Unity of Mankind: The Foundations of Anthropology in Nineteenth Century Germany. St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Kramer, Fritz W.
1977 Verkehrte Welten: Zur imaginären Ethnographie des 19. Jahrhunderts. Frankfurt, Germany: Syndikat.
1985 Empathy: Reflections on the History of Ethnology in Pre-Fascist Germany: Herder, Creuzer, Bastian, Bachofen, and Frobenius. Dialectical Anthropology 9:337–347.
1989 The Influence of the Classical Tradition on Anthropology and Exoticism. *In* The Humanities between Art and Science: Intellectual Developments 1880–1914. Michael Harbsmeier and Mogens Trolle Larsen, eds. Pp. 203–224. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
1993 The Red Fez: Art and Spirit Possession in Africa. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Krause, Fritz
1930 Tagungsberichte der Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde. Leipzig, Germany: Schindler.

Kuper, Adam
1978 Anthropologists and Anthropology: The British School 1922–72. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Landmann, Michael
1961 Der Mensch als Schöpfer und Geschöpf der Kultur. Munich, Germany: E. Reinhardt.

Landsberg, Paul Ludwig
1934 Einführung in die philosophische Anthropologie. Frankfurt, Germany: Vittorio Klostermann.

Leser, Paul
1931 Entstehung und Verbreitung des Pfluges. Münster, Germany: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Lessing, Theodor
1930a Der jüdische Selbsthass. Berlin: Meiner.
1930b Europa und Asien: Untergang der Erde am Geist. Leipzig, Germany: Felix Meiner.
1981[1921] Die verfluchte Kultur: Gedanken über den Gegensatz von Leben und Geist. Munich, Germany: Matthes und Seitz.
Loyke, Almut, ed.
1992 Der Gast, der Bleibt: Dimensionen von Georg Simmels Analyse des Fremdseins. Frankfurt, Germany: Campus, Edition Pandora.
Melk-Koch, Marion
1989 Auf der Suche nach der menschlichen Gesellschaft: Richard Thurnwald. Berlin: Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz.
Michel, Ute
1992 Wilhelm Emil Mühlmann (1904–1988)—ein deutscher Professor. *In* Jahrbuch für Soziologiegeschichte 1991. Carsten Klingemann, ed. Pp. 69–118. Opladen, Germany: Leske und Budrich.
Mühlmann, Wilhelm Emil
1938 Staatsbildung und Amphiktyonien in Polynesien: Eine Studie zur Ethnologie und politischen Soziologie. Stuttgart, Germany: Kohlhammer.
1944a Assimilation, Umvolkung, Volkwerdung: Ein globaler Überblick und ein Programm. Stuttgart, Germany: Kohlhammer.
1944b Die Völker der Erde. Berlin, Germany: Deutscher Verlag.
Olender, Maurice
1987 The Indo-European Mirror: Monotheism and Polytheism. History of Anthropology 3:327–374.
Poliakov, Léon
1971 Le mythe aryen. Paris: Calmann-Levy.
Radin, Paul
1966 The Method and Theory of Ethnology. *In* Classics in Anthropology. Stanley Diamond, ed. Pp. 64–87. New York: Basic Books.
Rammstedt, Otthein
1992 Editorischer Bericht. *In* Soziologie: Georg Simmel. Pp. 877–886. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
Rathjens, C.
1947 Tagung der Ethnologen in Frankfurt am Main vom 19. bis 21. September 1946. Erdkunde 1:107–109.
Riese, Berthold
1995 Während des Dritten Reiches (1933–1945) in Deutschland und Österreich verfolgte und von dort ausgewanderte Ethnologen. *In* Lebenslust und Fremdenfurcht: Ethnologie im Dritten Reich. Thomas Hauschild, ed. Pp. 210–219. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
Schmidt, Wilhelm
1939 The Culture Historical Method of Ethnology. With a preface by Clyde Kluckhohn. S. A. Sieber, trans. New York: Fortuny's.
1950 Introduction. Zeitschrift für Ethnologie 75:1.
Schultz, Bruno
1937 Taschenbuch der rassenkundlichen Meßtechnik. Munich, Germany: J. F. Lehmanns.
Schultz-Ewerth, E., and Leonhard Adam
1929–30 Das Eingeborenenrecht. Stuttgart, Germany: Kohlhammer.
Senghor, Léopold Sedar
1977 Liberté, vol. 3. Négritude et civilisation de l'universel. Paris: Gallimard.
Simmel, Georg
1950 The Sociology of Georg Simmel. K. H. Wolff, ed. and trans. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
Steinthal, Heymann
1891 An den Leser. Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde 1:10–17.
Stocking, George W., Jr.
1974 The Shaping of American Anthropology 1883–1911: A Franz Boas Reader. New York: Basic Books.
Streck, Bernhard
1989 Kultur als Mysterium: Zum Trauma der deutschen Völkerkunde. *In* Kultursoziologie—Symptom des Zeitgeistes? Helmuth Berking and Richard Faber, eds. Pp. 89–115. Würzburg, Germany: Könighausen and Neumann.
Thurnwald, Richard
1929 Social Systems of Africa. Africa 2:353–380.
1933 The Social Function of Personality. Sociology and Social Research 17:203–218.
1934 Pigs and Currency in Buin: Observations about Primitive Standards of Value and Economics. Oceania 5:119–141.
1939 Koloniale Gestaltung: Methoden und Probleme überseeischer Ausdehnung. Hamburg, Germany: Hoffmann und Campe.
von See, Klaus
1970 Deutsche Germanen-Ideologie vom Humanismus bis zu Gegenwart. Frankfurt, Germany: Athenäum.
Whitman, James
1984 From Philology to Anthropology in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Germany. *In* Functionalism Historicized. History of Anthropology, vol. 2. George W. Stocking Jr., ed. Pp. 214–230. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Wiggershaus, Rolf
1991 Die Frankfurter Schule. Munich, Germany: Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag.
Wundt, Wilhelm
1903 Ethik. Stuttgart, Germany: Kohlhammer.